

A petition is enclosed for a three-month extension to August 10, 1998 of the time to respond to this Office Action.

In response, the limitations of claim 5 have been incorporated into claim 1 and claim 1 has been revised so as to remove the explicit recitation of a memory and a plurality of execution units that was formerly in the preamble. Further, the reference to plural execution units has been amended to recite "an execution unit" so as to cover any number of execution units.

Dependent claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form incorporating the limitations of claim 1 with the same changes noted above.

Dependent claims 12 and 13 have been rewritten as independent claims 21 and 22 incorporating the limitations of independent claim 9.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite that the data transfer occurs during run-time of a compiled and compacted loop program.

In view of the above amendments and the Examiner's indication that claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 were allowable, it is believed that claims 1-4, 6-8, 21 and 22 are patentable.

Independent claim 9 is believed patentable because it recites an array prefetch apparatus that includes an array prefetch flag (line 10) and an array prefetch controller that is responsive to the settings of the array prefetch flag. For one setting, claim 9 requires that the array prefetch controller execute a load operation; and for the other setting, claim 9 requires that the controller execute a combination of an array load operation and an array move operation.

Kinoshita does not disclose or suggest an array prefetch flag that has settings that control whether the array prefetch controller executes a load operation or the combination of an array load operation and array move operation. In the absence of such a disclosure, claim 9 is believed to be patentable over Kinoshita.

Dependent claims 10 and 11 are believed patentable for the same reason claim 9 is patentable.

Independent claim 18 and dependent claims 19, 20 and 23 are believed patentable for the same reason claim 9 is patentable.

As indicated above, claim 14 has been amended to recite that the data transfer occurs during run-time of a compiled and compacted loop program. As the Examiner has noted, the Kinoshita reference does not teach any loop limitations. Accordingly, claim 14 is amended is believed patentable over Kinoshita. Dependent claims 15-17 are believed patentable for the same reason claim 14 is patentable.

Minor changes in the specification have been made at pages 9 and 17 to correct reference numerals.

For the foregoing reasons, the claims presently in this application are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 10, 1998

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Francis E. Morris 24,615  
(Reg. No.)

**PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP**  
-1155 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 790-9090

*Enclosure*